oners (

To; FCC Commissioners Washington, DC

DEC 11998

C MAIL ROUN Biennial Regulatory

Review admt., part 97 of the

Commissiom's Amateur Service

rules FCC WT docket 98-143

From :John J. Keating, WA2FVL 1147 Florence Ave Union Beach, N.J. 07735

Dear Commissioners,

I Hold a General Class Lic. And have been a Amateur

radio Op. since 1957

Here is my comments on Lic. re-strucurting. Have (3) three classes of Licensing (Which is the goal of the FCC) and they are.

A- Extra @ 20 wpm code profiency, @ one minute solid copy.

B- General@ 13 " "

C- Technician@ 5 " " " " " " "

We don't need the Novice, Tech plus, or the Advanced classes. Either meld the Advanced with the Extras, Or the Generals in with the Advanced In the 60's the Extra and Advanced where generated as a Incentive classes. I see the Advanced class as a overlap of the general class, and as a unnecessary class license. I also agree that the Tech and novice class are a overlap of each other.

So to reach a 3 tier class system, I recommend the above suggestion.

On the Morse code! It took me awhile to learn the code, now I do 15 to 20 comfortably. Its a form of discipline, Which is needed within the Amateur Community. And as far as the written requirements, I believe in what the FCC sets as the standard of electronic knowledge, needed.

As for the "Power" restrictions, with the advent of Lic. restructuring, The Tech class, if they get HF Privileges, should be limited to 100 watts cw only, and in the same operating frequencies as the novices now have. And with the generals and higher, the standard 1500 watts output. (I remember being rock bound and 50watts and I was happy to have that)

As for Disability waivers/ Definitely needs some improvement. There has to be, two doctor certificates to indicate the candidate for a lic. waiver. And I recommend each state have a 5 member panel to do the testing. The 5 member panel is unknown to the lic. candidate, with maybe two alternates, A minuium of three test panel members is needed to pass the test and wave the expention.

I believe in the (3) member panel VE testing setup. Therefore I would be against the Advanced class giving tests. PLEASE keep the 3 member test setup, I just think the door would be opened to more abuse, of testing.

No. of Copies rec'd\_ List ABCDE

THE FOC

On ENFORCEMENT, While there is a need for enforcement, I'm ngt aware of the ARRL thinking, We have OO's (Offical Observers) They should be given some authority to warn in the name of the FCC(With some training on this matter, and Certified) and have a system of "How many citations for infractions, could be initiated, ie [all OO's, E-mail monthly reports to the FCC and the ARRL on given citations mailed out, and be regeristed mail to the offendersl. When a known amount of citations FCC number) is noted on a indivual, then a show cause, or hearing, before a volunteer STATE panel of (3) OO's is required, before entering INTO A FCC hearing. (ITS A SORT OF A MEDIATION PANEL, TO GIVE A OFFENDING VIOLATOR A CHANCE TO AMEND THERE WAYS.before going to court.

I'm in agreement with "POWER" in the RF exposure table, with PEP input to antenna.

Also in agreement with, No one holding a FCC ticket, may apply for a Reciprocal permit for a alien amateur license.

Also in agreement to phase out RACES station license

All in all, If 3 licenses structure is the GOAL...go with A-Extra, B-general, C-Tech. 20wpm 13wpm 5wpm

Thanks for giving me the chance to address the commission, Which the ARRL didn't do for me.

Sincerely yours,

John J. Keating, WA2FVI 1147 Florence Ave

Union Beach, N.J.

Let do what's Forall Home

THE WORD ON THIS ... GET ANOTHER GENERAL to WRIT

J. J. Keating

ONCE Again, THIS My SIMPLE Letter, to The FCC, WITH SIX Copies feel free to use as is, or to use your own words, Don't let other Mess with your CLASS LICENSE, That you Enred. WRITE, AND get other gen. class he op's to write too.